

A

1061. h. 28
3

LETTER

TO THE

Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY,

Occasioned by his CALM ADDRESS
to the *American Colonies.*

Aut ego fallor,

Aut ego ledor.

Quæ mea culpa tuam, dixit, carissime, mentem

Vertit? Ubi est, quæ cura mei prius esse solebat.

OVID.

Manet imperterritus ille

Hostem magnanimum opperiens, et mole sua stat.

VIRGIL.

L O N D O N:

Printed for EDWARD AND CHARLES DILLY.

M.DCC.LXXV.

[Price 2d. or 1s. 6d. per Dozen.



OF THE

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE principal Arguments of Mr. JOHN WESLEY, in his CALM ADDRESS to our AMERICAN COLONIES, are taken *verbatim*, without acknowledgment, from Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON's Pamphlet, entitled, TAXATION NO TYRANNY.

The following Extracts from a Pamphlet, entitled, *Free Thoughts on the present State of Public Affairs*, published in 1770, by Mr. JOHN WESLEY, may suffice to shew the Inconsistency of that Gentleman's Character. In Page 1 of that Treatise, he says, "I am no Politician: Politics lie quite out of my Province." And in Page 14, "I do not defend the Measures which have been taken with regard to America. I doubt whether any Man can defend them, either on the Foot of Law, Equity, or Prudence."

How comes Mr. JOHN WESLEY, who was then no Politician, to commence one now? How comes he now, to appear a Defender of such Measures, as he before admitted to be indefensible?



PRINTED BY

JOHN WESLEY, at the Sign of the Cross, in St. Paul's Church-yard.



A L E T T E R

To the Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY.

REV. SIR,

THE grand question which is now debated, as you justly observe, is this, "Has the English Parliament power to tax the American Colonies? Or rather, has it a *right* to tax the Colonies—for with respect to the POWER *sub judice lis est*. Your answer to this question is very extraordinary, indeed; for you not only tell us "that the English Parliament has an *undoubted right* to tax all the English colonies," (p. 12, of your address) but roundly assert, (p. 21.) that every Sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects, that is, to grant their property, with or *without their consent*." Which you seem to think you sufficiently explain, by adding, "Our Sovereign has a right to tax me, and all other Englishmen, whether we have votes for Parliament-men or no."

And can you then mean it, Sir, as any thing but an insult to put such a question to the Americans, as you do (p. 22.) "Am I, or two millions of Englishmen made slaves because we are taxed, *without our own consent*? Yes, Sir, if you are taxed without your own consent, you are slaves. If every man that is taxed *without*

his own consent, is not a slave, wherein consists the difference betwixt slavery and liberty? You say to the Americans, (p. 16.) "What civil liberty can you desire, which you are not already possessed of? Do not you sit, without restraint, every man under his own vine? Do you not, every one, high or low, enjoy the fruit of your labour?" But pray, Sir, how can it be his own vine, when another claims a right of taking it from him without his consent? Or what man can be assured of enjoying the fruits of his labour, if liable, under the colour of right, to be deprived of it, without his consent? What property have we, says the immortal LOCKE, in that which another may by right take when he pleases to himself? If this be not the very quintessence of slavery, what is?

He must, however, be extremely ignorant of the nature of the English Constitution, who does not know, that the granting our own property, and not having it disposed of without our consent, is considered as the very Soul and vital Spirit of it, the grand palladium of British Liberty, and the bulwark of freedom.

"*Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus*

"*Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.*"

I am sure, Sir, you need not be informed that in England the King or Sovereign has nothing to do, strictly speaking, in the matter of taxing his subjects; nor the nobility; but the people alone, the Commons, the representatives of the people; who have ever been so jealous of this fundamental privilege, that no money bills are ever suffered to originate but from themselves, and when framed are never permitted to pass under the least alteration. And it is this power of the people which, in our well balanced constitution, serves as an equipoise

to that power which is lodged in the other branches of the legislature.

“ Were the *executive power*, that is the Sovereign, to determine the raising of public money, says the celebrated *Montesquieu*, otherwise than by giving its consent, (and surely you will not call this a *power of taxing*) LIBERTY *would be at an end.*”—*Spirit of Laws*, B. II, C. 6.

“ Taxation and Representation (says that able Lawyer and truly great man, Lord *Camden*, in his Speech on that Subject) are inseparably united. GOD hath joined them: no British Parliament can separate them: to endeavour to do it, is to stab our vitals.—My position is this—I repeat it—I will maintain it to my last hour — TAXATION and REPRESENTATION are inseparable—this position is founded on the laws of nature; it is more, it is itself an eternal law of nature: for whatever is a man's own, is absolutely his own; no man hath a right to take it from him without his consent either expressed by himself or his representative; whoever *attempts* to do it, attempts an *injury*; whoever does it, *commits* a ROBBERY; he throws down the distinction between LIBERTY and SLAVERY. Taxation and Representation are coeval with, and essential to, this Constitution.” Did this doctrine stand in need of formal proof, it were easy to refer you to a variety of ancient Statutes, which in the most express terms recognize this great principle of the Constitution. In the time of Edward I. 1297, a Statute was made to confirm the great charter, in which it is expressly declared that “ *Aids granted to the King shall not be taken for a custom, and shall not be raised BUT BY CONSENT.*” And in the year 1306 — That “ *The King or his heirs shall have no aid, without consent of Parliament,*” and

that “ *nothing shall be purveyed to the King’s use, WITHOUT THE OWNER’S CONSENT.*” But you are no stranger, Sir, to these and many other authorities of a like nature, having seen and read them in a performance you once admired, However you must now be supposed to despise it. “ When the Parliament laid a tax upon the Palatinate of *Chester*, says Lord *Camden* in the speech before referred to, and ordered commissioners to collect it there, as commissioners were ordered to collect it in other counties, the Palatinate refused to comply. They addressed the King by petition, setting forth, that the English Parliament had no right to tax them; that they had a Parliament of their own; that they had always taxed themselves, and therefore desired the King to order his commissioners not to proceed. The King received the petition, and he did not declare them either rebellious or seditious, but allowed them their plea, and they taxed themselves. You may see both the petition and the King’s answer in the Records in the Tower.” “ There is not, says the same truly noble Peer, a *blade of grass*, in the most obscure corner of the kingdom, which is not, which was not ever *represented*, since the constitution began: there is not a *blade of grass*, which, when taxed, *was not taxed by the consent of the proprietor.*”

To overturn all this reasoning, you tell us that you have no freehold, and consequently no vote for a parliament-man; that multitudes besides, are in the same situation; from whence you infer that the *Sovereign* (and it matters not what meaning you are pleased to affix to this word) has a right to tax his subjects with or *without their consent.* See p. 21, of your Address.—And can you, Sir, consider this as solid argument,

argument; would not you yourself, in any other case, look upon it as the most contemptible sophistry?

Whether you have or have not a freehold, you must either be able to purchase one if you chuse it, or else your property must be so small that it can be of no consequence to you who has the granting it; especially as they cannot, you know, give away any of your money without at the same time giving much more of their own. Forty shillings a year freehold give an Englishman a voice in the legislature of his country; and in many parts of the kingdom this privilege is extended to every freeman of a corporate town, to every one that pays the rates to King and poor, and in not a few boroughs to every one that boils a pot. Can it then be pretended with any colour of justice or reason, that in England the *Sovereign* hath a right to tax his subjects *without their consent*, when it is so glaringly evident that there is not a man in England who is able to boil a pot in ever so despicable a hovel, but may, if he pleases, have a voice in the disposal of his property? Suppose there were ever so many millions of Englishmen who undervalued their birthright, and did not think it worth their while to exercise it, yet still the right itself would exist, nor could it be said they were taxed *without their consent*, since by not exerting the power the constitution gave them of dissenting, had they been so disposed, they implicitly and to all intents and purposes *gave their consent*. And to keep up this power in its full vigour, and to transmit it, unimpaired, from generation to generation, you well know, Sir, that parliaments were originally never chosen for more than *one year*, at the expiration of which

term, the people again exercised their right of election, and thereby made it as clearly appear to be *true*, as you are pleased peremptorily to assert (p. 5.) it is *absolutely false*, that "every freeman is governed by laws to which he has consented." It is therefore fallacious to the last degree, and unworthy of a man of integrity and candour, to insinuate, as you are pleased to do, (p. 7.) that the people have "*ceded* to the King and Parliament the power of disposing *without their consent*, of both their lives, liberties, and properties." How is it *without their consent*, when they retain their place in the legislature by their representatives, and no act of Parliament is passed but *with their consent*? By the like mode of reasoning you undertake to prove, (p. 6.) that "when the electors are nearly equally divided, almost half of them must be governed not only *without* but even *against their own consent*." According to which every act of Parliament that meets with any opposition, should not be called an act of *Parliament*, but only an act of *part* of the Parliament, since it was *against the consent* of many of the Members of Parliament. As if every man did not know, that in all collective bodies, the determinations of the *majority* of that body are always considered as the determinations of the *whole body*; and that every man who enters into society implicitly *consents* that it should be so. You may call these childish quirks, Sir, *arguments*; I call them, and so, I believe, will every impartial person call them, mere quibbles. But possibly you think to evade the force of criticism, by what you afterwards observe, (*speaking of an implicit passive consent to laws made before we were born*), namely, "that *any other than this kind of consent*, the condition of civil life does

does not allow." But if it allows of any *kind of consent*, why talk of our being taxed *without our consent*, and *against our consent*; unless it be with an artful design to enflame your readers minds against the Americans, because they object to having their money disposed of *without their own consent*, that is, without the consent of their representatives in their provincial Assemblies?

"ALL THE INHABITANTS of the several districts ought to have, says *Montesquieu* speaking of the English Constitution, a right of voting at the election of a Representative, excepting such as are in so mean a situation as to be deemed to have no will of their own."—The *Commons*, says Judge *Blackstone*, in his Commentaries on the Laws of England, B. 1. P. 158. consist of *all such men* of any property in the kingdom, as have not Seats in the House of Lords; EVERY ONE of which has a voice in Parliament, either personally or by his representative. In a *free State*, EVERY MAN who is supposed a free agent, *ought to be* in some measure *his own governor*; and therefore a branch at least of the legislative power should reside in the *whole body of the people*. And this power, when the territories of the state are small and its citizens easily known, should be exercised by the people in their aggregate or collective capacity. But in so large a state as ours is, this would be impossible; it is therefore very wisely contrived, that *the people should do that*, by their representatives, which it is impracticable to perform in person.

But so low are your ideas of the power of the *people*, that you challenge any man living (p. 24.) to produce any instance in all history, wherein *the people* gave the sovereign power to any one, except to *Massaniello* of Naples; and I know of

no reason for your excepting him, unless it was to render, as you might think, the old Whig doctrine of the *Origin of power* being from *the people*, the more ridiculous. However, in return to your challenge I ask you, Sir, from whence any Sovereign ever received his power or could receive it, *but from the people?* Except you will come boldly forth and avow the old *jure-divino* doctrine; in which case we shall expect to see the CHARTER of Tyranny under the broad seal of heaven, and to have the miracles wrought in confirmation of its divine original well authenticated. You will not fail at the same time to favour us with the *consequences* of this doctrine, and to point out to us the man who is our KING *de jure*, whoever may be considered as our King *de facto*. 'Till this is done we shall still consider the *origin of all power*, under God, to be *the people*, unless you will undertake to shew that *one man* has more power than a *thousand men*, and is able to govern them without their own consent, either expressed or implied. What is it, Sir, but a pitiful sophism to deny that any Sovereign, but poor *Massaniello*, ever received his power from *the people*, because you know of no other instance in which all the people of any particular state or kingdom met together and formally conferred the Sovereign power upon any one. What if only *fifty*, or *twenty* of the Electors of the city of Bristol had thought proper to have appeared, and actually given their votes for Members of Parliament at the last Election; would not the rest, by not voting, when they might have done it, be considered as having implicitly *consented* to the choice made by those who actually did vote? And so in every change of government, the REVOLUTION particularly; was it not *the people* that, under God,

God, transferred the Sovereign power from King James, to that glorious patron of British liberty, King WILLIAM? The many that were inactive at that juncture, implicitly, or *passively*, (if you like that word better) united with those that were active, in bringing about that important event. And however you may play upon the words, and call the use of them "*political cant*;" *the people*, and *the people only*, are the *source of power*; and when Dr. Smith, in his sermon, (p. 31.) talks therefore of the people's *resuming* the power into their own hands when not exercised for the common safety, he does not talk of their *resuming*, as you suggest (p. 23.) what they *never had*; but what they *always had*, and *necessarily had*, and which no Sovereign on earth could have but *by their consent*. The army with us, is a part of *the people*, raised from amongst them, clothed, fed, and paid by them. In the case of William the Conqueror, the Norman people it is true, were too powerful for the Saxon or English people, but how this proves that no Sovereign but *Massaniello* ever received his power from *the people*, you have not yet shewn us. I shall therefore still consider *the people* as the *origin of power*, notwithstanding all you have said to the contrary, both in your present Address to the Colonies, and in your little piece on the *Origin of Power*, published some years ago; in which, as I remember, under an artful disguise, you have revived the good old Jacobite doctrines of *hereditary, indefeasible, divine right*, and of *passive obedience and non-resistance*.

And as the origin of power is from the people, so no fact can be plainer than that the people of this country never parted with the power of disposing of their own money, but always retained this privilege as a pledge of their constitutional

tional freedom, and a glorious mark of their distinction from the subjects of an arbitrary government; who not having the disposal of their own money, can be considered in no other light than that of slaves.

And why should we even *wish* to deprive of this privilege, our fellow-subjects in *America*? You yourself acknowledge, that the Colonists have not *forfeited* any of their privileges by emigration; but the *sum* of your argument, to prove the right of the British Parliament to tax them, is this. The Americans by crossing the sea, have rendered the *exercise* of their right of voting in the Election of Members of Parliament (supposing they had such a right before their emigration) no longer possible: but "they have not by abandoning their right in one legislature acquired a right to constitute another; any more than the multitudes in England who have no votes, have a right to erect a parliament for themselves:" they are therefore reduced (this you intimate is the only consequence) from the condition of voters to that of the innumerable multitude here in England who have no votes. See pages 8, 9, 10, of your Address. This is your argument, let us weigh it in the balance of sound impartial reason.

If the Americans by crossing the sea have rendered it no longer possible for them to have the disposal of their own money, you cannot surely represent their case as being parallel to that of those in England who have no votes; it is *fundamentally* different. In England, though the people are by no means *equally* represented, which is an acknowledged defect in the constitution; yet every man that has almost any degree of property may acquire a voice in the legislature if he pleases; and if he does not, he *consents in*
fact

fact to what is done by others, and cannot therefore with any propriety be said to have his property disposed of *without his consent*, for he really gives consent. What could he do more if there were a thousand new Parliaments constituted? And he may the more easily be satisfied with *this mode of consenting* to the disposal of his property; because he has always this security, that those who take an *active* part in the disposal of his property, must at the same time dispose of an equal proportion of their own. But not so with the American. If he has, not forty shillings a year, but forty pounds, or forty thousand pounds a year—yet still, if the British Parliament claim the power of taxing him, he can have NO VOICE in the disposal of his property, and which is still worse, those who are to have the power of disposing of it, are under every possible temptation to *abuse* that power; because every shilling they take out of the pocket of an *American*, is so much saved in their own. If the Americans, Sir, are indeed subject to such a power as this, their condition differs not from that of the most *abject slaves* in the universe. If their property may be disposed of *without their consent*, it matters not who disposes of it—the Great MOGUL—the Grand Monarque—or the *British Parliament*—they have no longer any property they can call *their own*, they are SLAVES, and the whole of their property lies at the mercy of those who rule over them.

And is this, Sir, a *necessary consequence* of their becoming Colonists? And did they fly from persecution here, brave the terrors of the seas, and transplant themselves into an American wilderness, to obtain the poor consolation of being *necessarily* involved in slavery, from the very circumstances of their situation? Who

can soberly entertain such a thought? No, Sir, their support under all the fatigues they bore, was the hope of enjoying unmolested the sweets of liberty, or, as you express it, of *sitting every man under his own vine*. “*They left their native country, says Mr. Hutchinson, with the strongest assurances, that they and their posterity, should enjoy the privileges of free and natural-born English subjects.*” “*The Americans,*” as Lord Chatham expresses it, “*are the SONS, not the BASTARDS, of England.*” “*The forefathers of the Americans, to use the words of Lord Camden, did not leave their native country, and subject themselves to every danger and distress, to be reduced to a state of SLAVERY. They did not give up their rights: they looked for protection, not for CHAINS from their Mother Country.*”

But you insist upon it, that by crossing the sea, though they did not *give up* nor *forfeit* any of their rights, they rendered the exercise of some of them *no longer possible*. True, it is *no longer possible*, that they should vote for Members of the British Parliament; consequently *no longer possible* they should be *represented* in the British Parliament, and therefore *no longer possible*—that the British Parliament should dispose of their property *without their consent*, by their own representatives in their respective houses of assembly,—without involving them in *absolute slavery*.

And *must* they be SLAVES? is it *no longer possible* that they should exercise the right of FREEMEN, that they should have Parliaments or Assemblies of their own, and grant their own money by their representatives as we do by ours here; because the Atlantic ocean rolls betwixt us and them? You say, they have no right to *constitute*

constitute another legislature; but why then were they from the very beginning of their existence permitted to form a legislative body, the *effigies parva*, as Mr. *Hutchinson* styles it, of the mother state? "The COMMONS of *America*, Sir, represented in their several assemblies, (to use the expressions of Lord *Chatham*) have ever been in possession of the exercise of this their constitutional right, of giving and granting their OWN MONEY. They would have been SLAVES if they had not enjoyed it. The idea of a virtual representation of *America* in this house, (says his Lordship, who was then a Commoner) is the most contemptible idea that ever entered into the head of man. It does not deserve a serious refutation."

But if the Colonists contend for the exercise of this right of granting their own money, you assert (p. 20.) in your usual dogmatic style, "they contend for neither more nor less than independency." And immediately add, "Why then do they talk of their *rightful Sovereign*? They acknowledge no Sovereign at all." To which I answer, in the words of the judicious and truly dispassionate author of *An Argument in Defence of the Colonies*, &c. p. 112.

"We need not, says this author, go so far back as the act of union to find a people that will not allow the *supreme legislature* of Great Britain, to alter a single letter in a law to tax them; and yet are no more independent than the people of the Colonies. IRELAND is subject to the same Sovereign as *America*. The people in *Ireland* choose their own representatives, so do the people in the Colonies. The people in *Ireland* are taxed by their own representatives, so have the people in the Colonies been ever since their first settlement. The crown appoints the

Lord

Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland*—the crown appoints the Governors of the Colonies. The Lord Lieutenant calls the meeting of the legislative body in *Ireland*. In the Colonies, the Governor calls an Assembly when he thinks proper, and adjourns, prorogues and dissolves it at his pleasure. The Irish Acts, are sent over to be allowed (not by the British Parliament, but) *by the crown*. The acts of the Colonies are the same. The representatives chosen by the people of *Ireland*, will suffer no duties to be collected from the people, but such as they grant themselves. And the representatives chosen by the people in the Colonies *claim the same right*."

Why then do you not ask the Irish, "Why they talk of their rightful Sovereign," and tell them "they acknowledge no sovereign at all"—because they claim a right of granting their own money? Your argument holds as good with respect to *Ireland*, as ever it can with respect to the Colonies: and why the *Colonists* should not be permitted to have the disposal of their own money as well as the *Irish* of theirs, without supposing they contend for *independency*, (which they solemnly disclaim) and without being told they acknowledge *no Sovereign at all*; I am sure it is past the art even of Mr. *Wesley's* logic to shew us: As much as it is for the Middlesex Justices (see their late curious Address,) to shew us how the Colonies are courting the King *to accept of ABSOLUTE POWER*, by claiming it as their undoubted right to dispose of their own property by their own representatives. These Justices seem to have mistaken the claims of the Colonies, for the powers *actually granted and accepted by the Quebec Bill*.

But you intimate to us, that the Colonists have implicitly *engaged* to submit to the taxation of
the

the British Parliament, by the very letter as well as spirit of their *charters*. But how does this appear; The Colonists with one voice declare the contrary, in the most express and solemn manner. And Mr. *Hutchinson*, one of their late Governors, (who will not be suspected of partiality to them,) declares, as I have before observed (see the preface to his history of Massachusetts-Bay, published 1760.) “*They left their native country with the STRONGEST ASSURANCES that they and THEIR POSTERITY should enjoy the privileges of free and natural-born English subjects.*” But how could they enjoy these privileges, if the first and fairest of them all, the right of *granting their own money*, was to be no longer enjoyed by them? How could they enjoy the privileges of Englishmen, if by their charters they were to be slaves? How could they enjoy the privilege of *freedom*, if from the very nature of *subordinate government*, as you suggest, p. 11, they are necessarily involved in slavery?

“The charter of Pennsylvania, you tell us, has a clause admitting in express terms, taxation by Parliament. And, if such a clause be not inserted in other charters, it must be omitted, you observe, as not necessary; because it is manifestly implied in the very nature of subordinate government: all countries which are subject to laws, being liable to taxes.” (To make your argument hold good here, you should have added, *without representatives*: for the Colonists have *always* been taxed, only it has been by *their* representatives.)

“It is true, you further observe, the first settlers in Massachusetts-Bay, were promised an exemption from taxes for seven years. But, say you immediately,

immediately, does not this very exemption imply, that they were to pay them afterwards?"

To all this I reply, that as to the exemption from *taxes* for seven years promised to the Massachusetts colony, I am credibly informed it has no reference at all to what we commonly mean by *tax*; but *quit-rents* for the land occupied by them; an exemption from the payment of which for a certain number of years is commonly granted to the first settlers in every new colony. Were we to suppose it to refer to an exemption from parliamentary taxation, we might well ask you, Sir, upon your own principles, what right had the King to promise by Charter, that the Parliament should not tax them for seven years? If, as you say, the Parliament always had this power of taxation over the Colonies, the King could not promise any more than you or I could, that the Parliament should not exercise this power for seven years.—And with respect to *Pennsylvania*, whatever construction the clause you refer to may bear, that it was never understood to mean what you suppose, a power of internal taxation for the purpose of raising a revenue, but merely the laying on of such duties as might be necessary solely for the regulation of trade, is evident from this simple fact. No such taxation was imposed upon the Colonies till the fatal æra of the stamp-act; and it was then universally reprobated by the Colonists as an innovation and a fundamental breach of their chartered, as well as inherent rights.

And may we not ask with wonder, If Parliament always possessed this power of taxing the Colonies, or however judged it consistent with the spirit of the English Constitution to exercise this power, why did they uniformly through a course of perhaps one hundred and fifty years, permit the Colonists to tax themselves, by their own

own Representatives, in their own Assemblies? And having been so long in possession of this right of granting their own money, have they ever forfeited it by an abuse of it? Not surely in the late war; for though this war was *not undertaken*, as you assert, on their account but in defence of the new plantation of *Nova-Scotia*; (the inhabitants of which have no concern in the present dispute,) yet it is well known to all the world, that the Colonists exerted themselves in this war even *beyond their power*, so that the King and Parliament judged it reasonable to make LARGE REIMBURSEMENTS to them at the close of the war. "They themselves, as Dr. Smith expresses it in his truly patriotic Sermon, (p. 20.) testified on our behalf, that in all things we not only did our part but *more* than our part for the common good, and they dismissed us home loaded with silver and with gold, in recompence for our extraordinary services." A fact this, which ministerial writers *never attend to*, but *cannot deny*. And yet you are pleased to talk of the *Mother Country's* desiring to be *reimbursed* for some part of the large expence she had been at in the late war, and that to this end she laid a small tax on one of her colonies." I wish Sir, you would discover more fairness and ingenuity in your representations.

Besides, do we not possess a MONOPOLY of the American trade; and is there not hereby an *immense revenue* secured to us? "When I had the honor of serving his Majesty, (says Mr. Pitt, now Lord Chatham,) I availed myself of the means of information which I derived from my office: I SPEAK THEREFORE FROM KNOWLEDGE. My materials were good. I was at pains to *collect*, to *digest*, to *consider* them; and I *will be bold to affirm*, that the profit to Great-Britain from the trade of the Colonies, through all

all its branches, is TWO MILLIONS A YEAR. This is the fund that carried you triumphantly through the last war. The estates that were rented at two thousand pounds a year, threescore years ago, are at three thousand pounds at present. Those estates sold then from fifteen to eighteen years purchase; the same may be sold now for thirty. YOU OWE THIS TO AMERICA. THIS IS THE PRICE AMERICA PAYS YOU FOR HER PROTECTION."

Upon the whole, Sir, I cannot express my sentiments on this subject more fully, or more decisively, than in the words of the author of "The Defence of the Colonies," &c. before quoted, which are (p. 91, 92.) as follows.

"If the people in America are *taxed* and not *represented*, their rights as subjects under the English constitution are as clearly invaded as they were in the case of the *ship-money*; and the province of *Massachusetts-Bay* now stands in the same situation, in behalf of the rights of the people of *America*, as Mr. *John Hamden* did for all the people of England in the last century. I am as much for the obedience of the people in America, as I can be against their illegal oppression. I would wish to be as far from wilfully shutting my eyes, and thinking all the people of the colonies *sautelefs*, as I would be to give up my reason, and believe those *incapable of mistake*, who exclaim so much against them. I am equally afraid of being misled in the mists that are raised by violence or interest on either side of the question. I contend not for men's prejudices. It is the rights only of my fellow-subjects in *America* that I mean to defend: and those rights, not such as are of vague and uncertain interpretation, but such as the English constitution makes the *unalterable property* of every man that lives

lives under the protection of its laws. And if the people of *England, Scotland, Ireland, or America* are ever to be taxed *without* having, or the possibility of having, *any choice* in those that impose the taxes upon them, they are no longer the subjects, but the *slaves* of government. Our constitution as established by the laws, is utterly repugnant to every attempt to divide the *right of taxation* from the *privilege of representation*. And could any pretence ever justify the separation of those rights with *a part of the subjects*, the same reasons would hold good *with the whole*. These rights are so essential to our constitution, that they make a part of the rules, by which the *legislature itself is bound to walk*. And it can no more take away the provision, the constitution has made for the security of THE PEOPLE'S PROPERTY, than it can THE PRIVILEGES OF THE PEERS, or THE KNOWN PREROGATIVE OF THE CROWN."

Your account of the ORIGINAL CAUSE of all our disputes and disturbances about American affairs, is curious.

You tell us with a grave face that *you make no doubt* (p. 14.) but that *a few men in England*, who are determined enemies to monarchy, are the *original cause* of the present breach between England and her Colonies. That these good men *cordially hate* the King, at least his office; and are in hopes of overturning the government, and erecting their grand idol, their dear commonwealth, upon the ruins of it. You doubt (p. 18.) whether any of the *Americans* are in the secret. The designing men, the *Ahitophels* are in England."

But the Americans, Sir, if we may judge of their dispositions, by that of the *Pennsylvanian Farmer*, will not thank you for your compliment. "It has been said in Great-Britain," says this *Gato of America*, (see his Essay, p. 26.) "that Lord

Chatham

Chattham, Lord Camden, and some other great men have taught the colonies to despise her authority. But it is as little true, as the multitude of invectives vented against the colonies. The constant practice in these publications, is to confound facts and dates, and then to rail. It should be remembered, that the opposition in America to the stamp-act was *fully formed*, and the congress held at *New-York*; *before it was known* on the Continent, that our cause was *espoused* by ANY MAN OF NOTE at home."

The opposition to the measures of the ministry respecting America, you will have it, however, is owing to these bad men, these *King-baters* you are so intimate with. For it seems, though they have let but *few* into the secret, the Rev. Mr. *Wesley* is one of that chosen few. Well, Sir, this serves to explain a matter which, I assure you, till now, puzzled me not a little.

All the world knows, that in your "*Free Thoughts on Public Affairs*," published 1770, you were pleased to say, (p. 14.) "*I do not defend the measures taken with regard to AMERICA, I doubt whether ANY MAN can defend them, either on the foot of LAW, EQUITY, or PRUDENCE.*" And it is well known, that you recommended the book I have repeatedly quoted in this letter, intitled; "*An Argument in defence of the exclusive right claimed by the colonies to tax themselves*," as a performance that would convince *any impartial person* of the justice of the American cause. It is moreover well known, that at the time of our late election, and many times since, you expressed yourself *very warmly* in different companies, and upon different occasions, in *favour* of the Americans, affirming that they were, in your opinion, an "*oppressed, injured people*;" that if they submitted to taxation by our Parliament, they "*must* be

be either FOOLS or KNAVES;" that they would then be *enslaved*, and if they were once enslaved, Ireland would follow next, and then England. That you wished well to our late American candidate, *because* he was a friend to America; and when addressing the electors of your own society, told them, with no small degree of vehemence, that now was the time for them to exert themselves if they wished to continue a free people; or words to that effect. — Now really, Sir, I thought you had been in earnest, and meant as you said when you expressed yourself in this manner, and have taken pleasure in assuring many persons who were not over-well affected to you, that you was a hearty friend to civil and religious liberty. I beg pardon for misrepresenting you, Sir, I perceive now that all your design was to get into the confidence of these bad men, these *King-haters* you talk of, and so by a *pious fraud* to blow up their abominable schemes. I perceive now, that when you said the Americans were an oppressed and injured people, you meant the very reverse. When you said, that, if they submitted to parliamentary taxation they would be *enslaved*, and must be either fools or knaves, you meant no such thing; but that "they would still have all the liberty they could desire, and might still rejoice in the common rights of FREEMEN (p. 16, and 22, of your Address) and sit without restraint, every man under his own vine.—And yet perhaps, I am still mistaken in your meaning; for your next publication may be as much in favour of the Americans as the present is against them, and possibly you may disclose to our view another set of *Ahitophels*, who are plotting the destruction of the present royal family, by first endeavouring to push on the ministry to the exercise of arbitrary power, and when it is become indifferent to the people

people what King rules over them, then, by the revival of the good old doctrine of *hereditary in-
defeasible* right, making a grand effort for the
restoration of the banished family of the STU-
ARTS, of *blessed memory*;

"Quo tenam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?"

For my own part, I am in no secret. I love,
I honor the King, have been taught from my
very infancy to venerate him almost to idolatry,
and am ready cheerfully to sacrifice my fortune
and my life, in defence of his Royal Person, and
the Constitution, of which he is the guardian. I
love and honor *all good men*, all men of real
principle and INTEGRITY, however they may
differ from me in political or religious senti-
ments; nor can any wish glow in my heart
more fervently, than that which I have long
panted to see accomplished, which is—That a
permanent peace and reconciliation may speedily
take place betwixt us and our American Colo-
nies, upon an honorable constitutional basis;
and that our beloved Sovereign GEORGE the
Third, may long live to sway the sceptre over
an *united, harmonious, free* people.

Hoping, Sir, for the sake of the multitudes
that follow you, that you will be more *steady* and
consistent as a *Divine*, than, I am sure, you are as
a *Politician*; and that when, you publish again
upon politics, you will not, under the idea of a
Calm Address to the Colonies, (the inhabitants of
which will probably never see your Address,) en-
deavour to inflame the minds of the people here
against their American Brethren; (already suffi-
ciently exposed, solely, to the resentment of
their Rulers,) but that you will write in a strain
more becoming a minister of the Prince of
PEACE,—I subscribe myself,

Reverend Sir, your sincere Well wisher,

And humble Servant,

BRISTOL;

Oct. 2, 1775.



AMERICANUS.